DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 875 HE 026 572

AUTHOR Sorcinelli, Mary Deane; Billings, Deborah A.
TITLE The Career Development of Pretenure Faculty: An Institutional Study.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. Center for Teaching.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Development; College Faculty; Collegiality; Comparative Analysis; Employer Employee Relationship; Higher Education; Job Enrichment; *Job Satisfaction; *Nontenured Faculty; Quality of Working Life; Questionnaires; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Morale; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *University of Massachusetts Amherst

ABSTRACT

A study examined untenured faculty at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) to determine their job satisfaction and work stress, changes in these areas over time, and ways the university could enrich their job experience. Two cohorts were studied via questionnaires. The first cohort comprised first-year faculty (N=23) and the second comprised all other tenure-tracked faculty (N=185). Questionnaires were returned by 100 faculty in the second cohort, and by 19 of 23 faculty in the first cohort; 20 of the first cohort faculty were also interviewed. Findings showed that from optimistic and enthusiastic beginnings, work stress increased and job satisfaction deteriorated over time. Budget restrictions and less resource availability were seen as being detrimental to career development. New faculty desired more assistance than they received in adjusting to their new setting and in establishing themselves as researchers and teachers, a condition particularly strong in female faculty. Finally, 82 percent of faculty, after their first year, indicated a likelihood of seeking jobs with other universities within the next year. These results suggest a greater need to provide social, intellectual, and physical support in attracting, developing, and retaining new and junior faculty, and recommendations for this are provided. Contains 10 references and 10 tables. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359875

THE CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF PRETENURE FACULTY: AN INSTITUTIONAL STUDY

HE026572

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Sorcinelli

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Center For Teaching

University of Massachusetts

at Amherst

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF PRETENURE FACULTY: AN INSTITUTIONAL STUDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AT AMHERST

Principal Investigator: Mary Deane Sorcinelli
Director
Center For Teaching

Project Assistant: Deborah A. Billings
Program Coordinator
Center For Teaching

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the cooperation and support of the many individuals who made possible the study, **The Career Development of Pretenure Faculty: An Institutional Study**. Funding was provided through a Joseph P. Healey Endowment Grant, Office of the President, and coordinated by the Office of Research Affairs, University of Massachusetts. Deborah Olsen, Director of Faculty Development, and Melissa Milkie, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington lent their technical counsel to the study. Special thanks go to Elizabeth Caldwell, graduate intern at the Center For Teaching, for her considerable help in reviewing and editing the final report.

We are especially grateful to each of the 20 new faculty and the 100 pretenure faculty in years two-to-tenure who, both in interview and questionnaire, contributed extensive and thoughtful comments. We hope that their efforts and our report will provide direction to the University as it seeks to attract and retain promising young faculty.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

METHODS.....1

The Instruments.....1

The Sample.....2

FINDINGS.....3

Overall Attitudes: Work Satisfaction and Stress.....3

Roles and Responsibilities.....6

Institutional Support.....8

Balancing Work and Life Away from Work.....12

Career Directions.....13

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS.....15

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY REVIEW.....17

WORKS CITED.....21

TABLES.....22

INTRODUCTION

During the early years of a faculty appointment, the potential for both rewards and pressures is great. New faculty must unravel the organizational structures and values, expectations for performance and advancement, and the history and traditions of their new campus setting. At the same time, they must learn to balance complex and sometimes conflicting roles and responsibilities. The ability of new faculty to navigate these early years is critical to their success in and satisfaction with an academic career. And the willingness of institutions to learn about these early years and to provide support may be vital to their ability to attract and retain faculty members.

Yet we know surprisingly little about the specific career tasks pretenure faculty face, why they are attracted to, remain in, or leave an institution, what stresses they experience and what satisfactions sustain and motivate them. Further, few studies have looked at the career development of new faculty over time (Boice, 1991; Fink, 1984; Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992; Whitt, 1991).

In spring semester 1991, the Center For Teaching began a study of all pretenure faculty at the University of Massachusetts. The aim of the study was not simply to document the experiences of untenured faculty, but also to answer four related questions. First, what factors contribute to new faculty satisfaction and stress? Second, do these factors change from the first to subsequent years? Third, how do pretenure faculty learn the skills and find the support they need to manage their careers? And fourth, what can the University do to enrich the experience of pretenure faculty.

METHODS

The Instruments

The approach taken was an unusual blend of ethnography (an open-ended accounting of responses and behavior) and standard survey techniques (which often channel people's responses into predetermined categories). The strength of the in-depth interview was the opportunity it provided faculty members for qualitative discussion and formulation of individual perspectives. The questionnaire data provided quantitative comparisons.

Both the interview schedule and questionnaire were based on measures developed in prior research on faculty career development (Baldwin and Blackburn, 1981; Blackburn

and Havinghurst, 1979; Near, Smith, Rice & Hunt, 1983; Sorcinelli, 1985). The interview covered the following general areas: career path, major responsibilities and interests (research/teaching/service), balancing work roles, balancing work and personal life, review and tenure criteria, greatest satisfactions and stresses, and career plans. The New Faculty Career Questionnaire included measures of work satisfaction, work stress, nonwork satisfaction, and satisfaction with the balance between personal and work life. In addition, faculty were asked what kind of programs and policies would contribute most to their own professional development.

Copies of both measures are available from the Center For Teaching upon request.

The Sample

Two groups were sampled in the study: (1) a cohort of first year faculty, and (2) all other tenure-track faculty. The size and composition of the sample is shown in Table 1.

We surveyed 87% of the universe of possible subjects in the first year, and 54% of those in the two-to-tenure category. The response rate from the years two-to-tenure cohort raises the question of whether the people who failed to respond were different in some way from those who did respond. We have reason to believe that they were. Preliminary queries by phone to a small sample of two-to-tenure faculty made it clear that many were concerned about the reactions their responses might provoke. Some were reluctant to respond to the questionnaire, even with a guarantee of anonymity. We would argue that the differences between the first year and the two-to-tenure cohorts are, if anything, understated; the latter cohort is probably even more disaffected than it appears because those who were most dissatisfied were less likely to respond. This possibility only serves to support rather than to challenge the conclusions and recommendations we draw from the two populations.

Year One

All new faculty who entered tenure-track positions at the assistant and associate professor level at the start of the 1990-91 academic year were asked to take part in the study. Of the 23 faculty in the 1990-91 conort, 20 volunteered to participate in the study. First-year faculty who did not participate were either off-campus or inaccessible by phone or mail.

All new faculty were contacted by the Center For Teaching and invited to participate in an hour-and-a-half interview on faculty career development. At the end of the

interview, a New Faculty Career Questionnaire was left with faculty to be completed and sent in at a time convenient to them. Nineteen of 20 questionnaires were completed.

Years Two-to-Tenure

The New Faculty Career Questionnaire was mailed to all tenure-track faculty hired at the assistant or associate level who had not yet been reviewed for tenure or who were up for tenure during 1990-91 (N=185). The mailing resulted in a 54% response rate (N=100).

In order to preserve anonymity, the questionnaires were not coded to identify respondents. As previously mentioned, preliminary queries by phone revealed that junior faculty were concerned about being identified. A guarantee of anonymity seemed advisable in order to gain cooperation. With the decision not to track responses, we also relinquished the opportunity for follow-up contact. Faculty received one mailing of the instrument and were asked to return it through campus mail.

FINDINGS

This report can only begin to analyze the wealth of information yielded by the interview and questionnaire instruments. The report will focus on the following five themes which emerged from the data: overall attitudes--work satisfactions and stresses; responsibilities and interests--relationships among teaching, research and service; institutional support--attitudes toward the workplace, its demands and reward structures; career directions--factors that influence retention; and work and personal life--the struggle to strike a balance.

In detailing each theme, data on the first year cohort are presented; then, contrasts are drawn between the first year and all other pretenure years (two to tenure). Although the numbers of women (N=11) and racial and ethnic minorities (N=6) in the first-year cohort are too small to ensure statistically representative conclusions, tentative findings that suggest marked differences by gender, race, or ethnicity are reported.

Overall Attitudes: Work Satisfaction and Stress

Work Satisfaction

Perhaps the most remarkable and encouraging finding of this study is the generally high level of morale that new faculty at this university demonstrate. Overall, the first year faculty were optimistic, enthusiastic, and committed to the campus and their careers--even in the face of a barrage

of cuts to public higher education that easily could have left them demoralized, disillusioned, and dispirited.

New faculty satisfaction with the "intrinsic" rewards of an academic career (i.e., factors intrinsic to academic work itself and not dependent on external circumstances) was especially strong and consistent (see Tables 2 and 3). Thus, for example, newcomers reported high levels of satisfaction with the nature of academic work and the relative autonomy with which it is pursued, the opportunities for intellectual discovery and growth and use of their skills and abilities, the opportunity to have an impact on others, and the sense of accomplishment. Women were particularly satisfied with opportunities to have an impact on others and to use their skills and abilities. An assistant professor observed: "The lures to academia are many. I find the chance to illuminate a research problem uncommonly interesting. I find the teaching deeply satisfying. And I feel fortunate to have the chance to stay curious and to keep on learning."

A number of new faculty also cited support from colleagues in their department as important. For some, the major attraction to UMass and the reason for remaining during hard times was the quality of individual colleagues, and the intellectual and collegial ethos of the department:

> The colleagues that I work with make all the difference. We're a small program but we've got ideas, energy, and enthusiasm. Beyond that I feel comfortable with people in my department. There's not a lot of head-butting and positioning for influence. I'm never treated like a rookie.

Moreover, opportunities to work with top graduate students and, in some cases, talented undergraduates were also noted as attractive: "I taught at Harvard and I can tell you that students here are bright. The only difference is that there are not as many self-starters. They need more direction and giving them some guidance is what makes teaching fun."

More tangible aspects of the work environment also enhanced morale. New faculty credited several campus offices with providing internal funds for research and teaching, advice about scholarship and teaching, and the collegial sharing of ideas. The Center For Teaching (Lilly Teaching Fellows Award, seminars on teaching), the Employee Assistance Program (tenure support group), the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities (Junior Fellows), and the Office of Research Affairs (Grants for Research, grant-writing seminars) all were cited.

Among the two-to-tenure cohort, however, faculty satisfaction with the intrinsic rewards of the career showed less strength and consistency. While satisfaction with personal autonomy, opportunities to have an impact on others, and sense of accomplishment remained fairly strong, data showed a downward turn in satisfaction with opportunities to continue learning and to use skills and abilities (see Table 2). Since a considerable body of evidence suggests that intrinsic rewards are the mainstay of an academic career, any erosion of personal and intellectual rewards is a cause for concern.

Work Stress

It was intriguing to find that for first year faculty, high satisfaction and stress could coexist--the opportunities for personal and intellectual growth offset the stresses of balancing multiple demands and anxieties about "extrinsic" rewards (job security, salary, and benefits). But we wondered whether work stress would erode satisfaction for those in the two-to-tenure cohort.

The answer appears to be yes. The proportion of two-to-tenure faculty reporting their worklife as "very stressful" was dramatically greater than among faculty in year one--from 29% of newcomers to 72% of other pretenure faculty (see Table 4). We expected that the two-to-tenure faculty would experience greater work stress with the approach of tenure. The degree to which the budget crisis heightened the level of stress is less clear, although comments from faculty seemed too specific to dismiss as chronic pre-tenure stress.

Many pretenure faculty attributed their stress to fallout from the budget crisis occurring in the state and at the University. While new faculty were not impervious to the stresses engendered by financial shortfalls and funding problems, many held out more hope than did their years two-to-tenure counterparts that the fiscal exigencies of the University and the state would improve: "My perspective is that since I've arrived at the lowest point, things can only get better."

Themes of frustration and disillusionment were dominant in the sample of faculty in years two-to-tenure. The budget crisis occurring in the state and at the University seemed a hydra-headed creature, manifesting its impact at multiple levels. For example, less money for the institution meant fewer meaningful rewards in terms of salary and benefits; a sense of insecurity about reappointment and tenure; an increased workload (especially teaching loads) which sometimes resulted in restricted time for research and consequently threatened tenure prospects; difficulties in balancing research, teaching, advising, committee and

administrative work; and less support for scholarship and teaching. Less money also fostered alienation among the levels of the institutional hierarchy and called into question the competence and commitment of administrators. One pretenure faculty member summed it up:

> This past year has been the worst in my life. The budget crisis, being targeted on the administration's hit list, teaching overcrowded large classes and Ph.D. seminars, sitting on committees, publishing, etc. I have found no time for a personal life and am severely underpaid. I feel I receive no support to make myself at home here because everyone is overstressed and exhausted. I came here because this was my dream job. Because of the financial situation it has turned into a nightmare.

Roles and Responsibilities

Research

Research was characterized as a top priority by many new faculty. One assistant professor observed, " I really enjoy the research. It's like an internal force driving you to do the work. Sometimes it becomes hard to tear myself away from a problem. I don't know if I could ever stop."

Despite the draw of scholarship, many new faculty members reported that it soon became clear that research goals they had set upon arrival would not be achieved in their first year or two. The overwhelming problem for most was carving out research time. Many described ambitious plans to write several articles, finish a book or get a lab up and running. Instead, they were faced with the immediacy and imperatives of coursework and administrative tasks. Some complained that time they did spend on research was spent struggling to set up their offices or labs and hunting down equipment, supplies, computer resources and technical support. One new faculty member, describing a year-long wait for a computer, said, "I had to fight and fight for my PC. All year I used a typewriter--which was like owning a spear when everyone else had machine guns."

Other research stresses included a lack of colleagues or graduate students with similar research interests, gaps in knowledge and skills not acquired in graduate training, and pressures to secure outside funding.

Some women and minorities reported scholarly isolation and expressed concerns that their research interests were "marginalized." Some also reported being asked less frequently than others in their department and school to participate in research-related activities:

> It is painful to describe the sense of isolation and neglect from my peers that I have felt. I need some pointers. I'd like some suggestions on which journals would be best to publish in or which professional contacts would be useful to make. I've not coauthored with people in my department. Do I present something they don't like? Is it an issue of diversity? This is a big source of concern.

Teaching

New faculty were committed to doing a quality job in teaching and had set high standards for themselves. They felt a responsibility to offer courses and lectures which were well-prepared, and to set aside time for students outside of class. They also wanted to motivate students to continue to learn: "The trick is to get students past the grade as the only measure of learning. I'm happiest when I can get them to really dig into an assignment or get caught up in a class discussion."

While teaching was seen as a positive challenge, it was not without pressures and frustrations. Many new faculty reported spending much more time on teaching and much less time on research than they had expected. Again, the major challenge was time--not enough time to prepare new courses (several respondents designed four new courses their first year), to develop tests, to grade, and to advise students. One new faculty member explained that it was not the number of classroom hours itself that created problems:

> When I say that I've put nearly all my time into teaching, you have to factor into my first-year teaching load not only the number of contact hours, but also the number of separate courses to prepare and teach, the size of the classes, the total number of students taught, and the extra conferences.

Newcomers also indicated difficulties in teaching large lecture classes in poorly equipped classrooms, in dealing with poorly prepared or unmotivated students, and in compensating for their own inadequate preparation for teaching (learning not to cover too much content, set excessively high expectations for students, talk too fast): Teaching has taken a lot more time than I thought. I spent hours preparing for each class. I know I've been guilty of overteaching a bit."

In addition, women faculty described difficulty in establishing authority in the classroom. Several reported that as a consequence of attempting to "let students know

who was in charge," they were perceived as formal, distant, and lacking humor. One woman reflected:

> My first semester was horrible. In my first class I had over 200 students. My colleagues told me this was the nightmare course and that scared me. I had to appear tough, and boy did I hold the line. After it all, I couldn't finish reading my evaluations. They said the content of the course was good but they hated my formality and distance. I had been used to being the graduate assistant they liked versus the teacher. It was psychologically very hard.

According to both first year faculty and those in years two-to-tenure, the above pressures were accentuated by the incongruency between teaching demands and the reward structure. Teaching responsibilities in the early years were demanding, those demands seemed amplified by present conditions, and as a result compromised more heavily rewarded activities such as research. Pretenure faculty clearly felt that teaching should be given more weight in review and tenure decisions (see Table 5).

Service

There was considerable variation in the time new faculty reported spending in service to their departments, schools, and the University. Most found requirements to be fair and felt that their departments did not make excessive demands. For some, such service as sitting as non-voting members on the departmental personnel committee provided valuable insights into the review and tenure process. For others, service provided an outlet for action not always available in research or teaching. "I feel as if I'm in a position to make a difference," said one new faculty member. "My service affords avenues for impact." By and large, if new faculty complained of anything, it was the lack of recognition by the chair of her/his role in "counseling new faculty against overextending themselves."

Institutional Support

Collegial Relations

Few areas are more important to academic life than the intellectual and social dimensions of collegiality. Interviews revealed that collegial relationships were both more and less than new faculty had hoped for. On one hand, a number of new faculty found their colleagues to be eminent and thoughtful scholars who had much to offer them. One newcomer spoke for several when he described his colleagues as "among the highest quality that I've come across." On the other hand, while new faculty reported general

encouragement from colleagues, they were much less likely to have received concrete help with scholarship (e.g., offering to collaborate on a research project or to review a manuscript or grant proposal) or with teaching (e.g., sharing syllabi, suggesting ways to deal with difficult students, visiting a class). As one reported, "Pats on the back and hearty handshakes just haven't been enough."

In fact, across the first-year cohort, mentoring of new faculty did occur in a few departments but it was not widespread. Women and minorities in the study described acute feelings of personal isolation and solitariness, and struggled to establish intellectual and social contacts. Despite stated desires for someone who could help them, minorities were virtually without mentoring except when they acted as mentors for one another.

The degree of satisfaction with support from colleagues declined somewhat from the first to second cohort, but less so than in other studies of junior faculty (Sorcinelli and Austin, 1992). Pretenure faculty who rated their relations with colleagues as open and collegial were more likely to describe those senior colleagues as being optimistic about the future of the campus, engaged in teaching and research, interested in their students, and generous with conversation and support.

However, fiscal problems in the University as well as barriers of age, gender, race, interests or departmental politics appear to have eroded relationships and conditions in some departments. For some, less money for the department had resulted in increased workloads which generated bad feelings when junior faculty saw themselves as doing more of the additional work than tenured senior members of their department: "Throughout the university many junior faculty are responsible for many more students and more committee work than older tenured faculty who are making much more money. Also in comparision to older colleagues, we continually teach and publish more."

Governance

Although many new faculty were concerned with how the fiscal crisis was being handled by campus administrators, their locus of support and validation was within their departments. The department chair was the most crucial advocate during the first year. In a small number of cases, new faculty reported "benign neglect" and a concomitant lack of contact and support from their chairs. "Sometimes I would like more feedback from the chair," commented one respondent, "but I hear you only get feedback if you're doing poorly."

However, in general, new faculty spoke positively about their chairs. Chairs who were cited as particularly helpful

seemed to take time to assign courses which fit interests and priorities, to negotiate minimal preps or a reduced load during the first year, to secure internal funds for resources or travel, and to provide guidance for annual reviews. "I have to thank my chair," said one new faculty. "Without him I would have had an impossible time getting started. I found that I could go in and present a seemingly unsolvable problem and somehow we could arrive at a solution."

The two-to-tenure cohort, however, began to focus their comments on governance at the campus level. There was sympathy for administration in what everyone, critics as well as friendly observers, agreed were difficult times. The problems of funding were so enormous and pervasive--particularly the problem of where to find the funds to maintain the scholarly prominence of the University--that most pretenure faculty acknowledged the administration's dilemma in this regard. One pretenure faculty commented," I don't blame my department, my dean, or the University. I do blame the horrible, horrible state of Massachusetts where economic privilege overrules common sense."

Still, many pretenure faculty did not feel that the University was dealing with its crisis well. They cited a "mentally toxic" atmosphere on campus due in part to an absence of leadership. Several felt that an administration which was "bold, aggressive and committed to fighting for the university would do wonders for morale." According to one:

> How could any sentient person who cares about education be left whole by the devastation being wrought on our university by the state government. How could any young faculty member not strongly consider leaving, when virtually all our administration has fled like cowards, rather than stand and fight back? Leadership is more than big salaries and comforting words. It involves a duty to fight for and suffer with those who trust in and depend upon those leaders. Where is UMass's leadership cadre?

Resources

Perhaps most striking in the interviews was the difficulty new faculty had in securing resources essential to conducting research and optimizing the environment for teaching. Exceptions to this rule were the few instances when new faculty received sizeable promised set-up funds. In terms of scholarly resources, many cited the need for more competitive graduate student assistantships; more library materials, photocopying monies, and travel allowances; adequate equipment for labs; and internal grant

funds for research. One pretenure faculty member described the impact of declining library resources:

> The [discipline-specific] Library is inadequate. The collection is poor, the organization is poor, and the work environment is horrible. It is degrading as a faculty member and scientist to have to sit on the floor, or in cramped, poorly lit, overheated, generally depressing circumstances. I no longer use the library and prefer to accumulate work and travel to [a university library in another state]. My scholarly work and development is discouraged by this situation."

Teaching, too, could be improved by additional resources. Large, impersonal classes and reductions in teaching assistants, lecture and lab facilities, and teaching development funds were seen as constraints. The cumulative effect of such losses is reflected, in part, in the drop in faculty satisfaction with support of scholarship and teaching from the year one to the two-to-tenure cohort (see Tables 2 and 5).

Tenure

The press to obtain tenure did not consume most first year faculty. And although the fiscal crisis was an ever-present consideration, many felt that dwelling on their immediate job security was anxiety-producing and unproductive. The more omnipresent concern was reappointment. Some new faculty expressed tension about facing year after year of rigorous review, particularly if the criteria for evaluating their research, teaching, and service seemed unclear. Others had had no review of their first-year work and wondered whether they should approach their chairs.

Anxiety about insufficient or inadequate feedback did not diminish in the two-to-tenure cohort. By the tenure year, junior faculty have often undergone several departmental reviews, and the department and university have taken on a more complex role in that they provide both support and evaluation. It was not entirely surprising to find that the two-to-tenure cohort faculty reported less satisfaction with feedback on how well they were doing, and recognition of their work by the university. Some reported receiving "antiseptic" or "blah" reviews and for a few, reviews appeared "negative." One respondent commented, "The overwhelming feedback is negative, simply because responsible senior faculty intending to provide helpful criticism focus on negative points. It becomes contrary to the process to provide positive feedback lest it be construed as binding." Both new and junior faculty

recommended that departments consider more supportive and informal reviews for at least the first year.

Rewards and Recognition

Although new faculty satisfaction with their work is based primarily on intrinsic factors, dissatisfaction appears to center on extrinsic, organizational factors such as job security and salary. In fact, the most consistent source of dissatisfaction across both samples stemmed from anxieties generated by the external reward structure (salary, fringe benefits, job security).

Throughout the interviews, concerns about financial and other rewards were coupled with concerns about the environment for career development. Although new faculty were quick to acknowledge that financial reward was not the reason that they pursued an academic career, they viewed salary as one way the institution and the commonwealth set a value on and expressed its esteem for their contributions. The on-going salary freeze, lack of merit pay, higher benefit costs, furloughs, and departments targeted for reduction and elimination had taken their toll on perceptions of self-worth as well as finances. "I have had three very productive years with no reward. My attitude toward this university, this state, and my own career have taken a 'nose-dive'," said one pretenure faculty.

Finally, it appears that the issue of compensation becomes more of a stress over time. There was a significantly lower level of satisfaction with salary, fringe benefits, and job security in the two-to-tenure cohort than in the first year cohort (see Table 5). Dissatisfaction with compensation became more prominent than worries about job security, time pressures, the balancing of work demands, and support for scholarship.

Pretenure faculty also expressed concern about what was often described as a need for recognition. By the end of their first few years, faculty who had worked hard, and had the publications and awards to prove it, often complained that they then heard nothing locally, despite disciplinary or national recognition. Such junior faculty expressed a simple desire for acknowledgement from their colleagues.

Balancing Work and Life Away From Work

Balancing the conflicting demands of professional life --teaching, writing, staying current in one's field, grantsmanship, service to the University and profession--is a source of stress for new faculty. We wondered if efforts to balance the demands of professional work and personal life would compound new faculty stress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results of this study indicate that the successful negotiation of work and nonwork responsibilities is a critical challenge for pretenure faculty. New faculty derive great satisfaction from family life (i.e., children, marriage). At the same time, they described acute frustration in finding time and energy for work as well as for partners, children, dual careers, and commuter relationships. They also cited conflicts between time for work and for friendships, exercise, reading, hobbies, social and civic activities (see Table 8).

Interestingly, while measures of work satisfaction declined, both interview and questionnaire responses indicate that measures of satisfaction with personal life increased from year one to years two-to-tenure (see Table 9). One junior faculty member explained: "My morale is up and down everyday. The one thing I am consistently happy about is my family life and that is what makes my going to work less stressful."

Moreover, new faculty expressed an acute need for more flexible employment policies at the University--more opportunities for spouses, and flexible employee benefits such as parental leaves, flexible time limits for tenure, better childcare options, joint appointments (see Table 10). And salary once again appeared in discussions about life outside of work, especially among faculty with young children. As one new parent concluded:

> After three years and no rewards I am discouraged. The fact that we decided to have a child made matters more complicated. My wife must work to make ends meet and we must somehow balance childcare and work. We also live 20 miles from the University further exacerbating the problems of juggling childcare and work. However, junior faculty generally cannot afford to live in this town. Anyway, I could go on, and on, and on. Frustrated--you bet! We really want to build a home and a career here but everytime we turn around someone kicks us again.

Career Directions

A final measure of the environment of career opportunities and constraints appears in the number of junior faculty members either seeking or considering seeking positions at other institutions. Here again, the impact of the fiscal exigencies of the University and state on the perceived environment for opportunity is telling. The proportion of faculty reporting that it is very likely that they will try hard to find a position with another university within the next year rose from 0% among first year faculty to 53% among faculty in years two-to-tenure.

And an equally sizable proportion of new faculty (58%) were at least somewhat likely to try hard to find another position within the next year, as were the year two-to-tenure faculty (29%). This is in contrast to 42% of new faculty and only 18% of faculty in years two-to-tenure who reported that they are not at all likely to seek new academic positions within the next year (see Table 6).

Given the uncertainties about University and state finances, a number of pretenure faculty were simply not sure what would happen and what to do:

> It is difficult trying to make decisions about the future when we don't have information on what is the likely future here. It feels as if we are sitting in a frying pan slowly cooking. Also, it's difficult to continue to work so hard and wonder if it will matter in the end. Perhaps worst, making promises to students and colleagues while not knowing if you'll be here to fulfill commitments to them creates much moral dilemma and stress.

For faculty who had decided to leave, factors influencing their choice were complex; they often included greater job security, opportunities for advancement, improved salary and standard of living, more resources, better chair or departmental support, and personal and family considerations:

> I'm leaving UMass because of my salary which has been too low for too long with little attention to legitimate equity concerns. I'm leaving because of the financial problems of the University and state which have affected my job and public education in Massachusetts. My major reason for leaving, however, is because of horrible job opportunities for my spouse.

Support for Professional Development

When asked what sorts of programs they feel would best facilitate their professional development, and offset some of the factors viewed as liabilities to their careers, faculty gave their highest endorsement to programs that would contribute to their development as scholars and teachers (grants for research and released time/funding for teaching). Not surprisingly, faculty also felt that improved facilities and resources (libraries, labs, computer equipment, studios), funds for professional meetings, and staff support (research assistants, clerical personnel) would contribute greatly to their work.

Finally, new faculty endorsed programs that would introduce them to campus colleagues and resources (mentoring programs, orientation activities, workshops/support for teaching and grant-writing). Overall, the rankings of pretenure faculty in years two-to-tenure were consistent with those of new faculty. Obviously, it takes several years for new faculty to adjust to the campus and to an academic career, and material and social supports remain important over time (see Table 7).

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

In general terms, then, what can be said about the experiences of new and junior faculty members at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst? This study indicates these points:

1. New faculty at our campus arrive with enthusiasm and optimism about opportunities for growth in their careers. Despite growing concerns about an environment that provides less financial, material, and emotional support than they feel they need, they exhibit a high level of morale. Faculty in years two-to-tenure, however, show a substantially lower level of work satisfaction and a higher level of work-related stress. The percentage characterizing their worklife as "very stressful" rose from 29% of newcomers to 72% of other pretenure faculty.

2. Among new faculty, satisfaction with the intrinsic rewards of the career (autonomy, opportunities for intellectual discovery and growth, sense of accomplishment) is strong and consistent. Among the two-to-tenure cohort, however, data reveals less satisfaction with the personal and intellectual rewards which are the mainstay of an academic career.

3. Unequivocally, the budget crisis occurring in the University and the state is a critical factor in pretenure faculty dissatisfaction. The decline in extrinsic rewards (salary, fringe benefits, job security) is seen as most pressing. Faculty also perceive the decline of resources for scholarship and teaching (internal grants, libraries, computer equipment, labs, studios, classroom materials and facilities, graduate student assistants, clerical support) as detrimental to their careers.

4. Chair and colleague relations contribute significantly to new faculty members' sense of commitment and loyalty to the University. Department chairs are a critical source of socialization for new faculty. Senior colleagues, too, are important to creating a positive professional environment. New faculty desire more assistance than they are getting from senior colleagues in adjusting to their new setting and in establishing themselves as researchers and teachers.

5. Pretenure women and minority faculty meet some additional obstacles as they adjust to university life. They experience unique challenges in establishing research and teaching careers, and experience less contact with and sponsorship from colleagues. Women report a different kind of experience than men do in balancing work, marital, and family life.

6. There is considerable cause for concern about the retention of pretenure faculty especially after the first year. While no first year faculty were actively seeking positions on other campuses, fully 82% of faculty in years two-to-tenure report themselves as "somewhat" or "very likely" to try hard to find a position with another university within the next year.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY REVIEW

Results of the study suggest that providing social, intellectual and physical support may be critical to attracting, developing and retaining new and junior faculty. Campus administrators, deans, chairs and senior faculty all need to view support and recognition of new faculty as an investment in the success of a faculty career and ultimately of a department.

The following recommendations evolved from suggestions offered by new and junior faculty involved in the study as well as from related data on new faculty (Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991; Sorcinelli and Austin, 1992). They are presented in five categories: support for research and teaching, encouraging collegial relations, clarifying review and tenure processes, and balancing work and family life.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TEACHING

Recommendation 1: Implement plans to increase support for research and scholarly work. Even in difficult budgetary times, the University cannot abrogate its responsibility to nurture and aid the scholarship of its developing faculty. Resources such as internal grants, materials for libraries, labs, computers, and studios, funds for professional meetings, and staff support (e.g., research assistants, clerical personnel, technicians) are of paramount importance.

Recommendation 2: Increase support for teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level. New faculty report spending a great deal of time on teaching and worry about what to teach, how best to teach, and how to motivate students. Large lecture courses are seen as particularly difficult to cope with. Formal support through internal grants (Lilly Teaching Fellows, Faculty Grants For Teaching) is important and should be expanded. Evidence also suggests the benefits of working with senior faculty "Mentors" or a teaching consultant from the Center For Teaching. Informal support such as more frequent discussions about teaching performance with chairs and senior faculty also would help.

Recommendation 3: Examine and make more flexible the teaching, advising, and service load of new faculty. In establishing research and teaching careers, pretenure faculty feel severe time pressures. Workloads need to be appropriate to support both research and teaching development. New faculty might be offered fewer courses or, at the very least, fewer preps during the first year or two of appointment.

Funds could be allocated for a flexible leave program to allow pretenure faculty to complete scholarly projects prior to tenure review.

Recommendation 4: Review departmental and college policies for assigning graduate assistantships to ensure that pretenure faculty receive equitable support. New faculty need access to graduate students to develop research funding and to provide intellectual support. Providing opportunities to teach graduate seminars, ensuring funds to advertise for graduate students, and acknowledging that it can take several years for new faculty to recruit and train graduate assistants offer a starting point.

Recommendation 5: Examine the distribution of space, equipment and clerical support to new faculty within departments. New faculty report difficulty in securing basic resources (adequate office, lab, studio space, computers, research and instructional materials, clerical help). Chairs need to help secure such support at the time new faculty accept an appointment to ensure that newcomers receive adequate and timely assistance.

Recommendation 6: Set aside travel funds for pretenure faculty. Lack of travel funds is particularly acute for pretenure faculty who are least able to afford the financial burden of travelling to professional meetings but who most need to attend, present papers, and establish a reputation. Earmarking travel funds would actively support research as well as help to reduce the intellectual isolation felt by many new and junior faculty members.

Recommendation 7: Encourage collaborative scholarship by providing monetary support for seminars that link senior and junior faculty or junior faculty with one another. The Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities has had considerable success in bring junior and senior faculty together to discuss research interests across the disciplines. The Center For Teaching has had similar success with instructional issues. Small grants for departmental or interdisciplinary projects (in both research or teaching) might offer new directions.

ENCOURAGING COLLEGIAL RELATIONS

Recommendation 8: Articulate the role of the department chair in supporting and developing new faculty. Results of this study emphasize the important role department chairs play in new faculty development. The University should create worksessions for department chairs addressing issues such as performance counseling, encouraging professional growth, and the particular needs of new faculty who are women and minorities. Small grants funding department-defined faculty development projects also would be helpful.

Recommendation 9: Develop mentoring programs for pretenure faculty. Most new faculty, particularly women and minorities, emphasized social and intellectual isolation as a problem. A representative group of faculty could explore different mentoring programs and recommend workable models. For example, the use of "Mentors" in the Lilly Teaching Fellows Program could be examined. Effort should be made to reward senior faculty members for the time spent working with their junior colleagues.

Recommendation 10: Expand the orientation of new faculty on campus-wide, college, and departmental levels. New faculty desire information about the University as they start their appointments. An expanded orientation program can shorten the time newcomers take to become integrated into their departments and the University. The program should include opportunities to build relationships among new and established faculty, as well as information about teaching, research, and campus resources.

(Recommendations 2, 6, and 7 also provide ideas for encouraging collegiality.)

CLARIFYING REVIEW AND TENURE PROCESSES

Recommendation 11: Chairs and departments should review tenure and promotion criteria to make sure that they are up-to-date, clear, and matched to the particular mission and resources of the unit. Vague, ambiguous, changing, or unrealistic expectations seem to be primary sources of concern. A statement of expectations should be included in the letter of appointment issued to new faculty members.

Recommendation 12: Chairs, departments, and academic administrators should address the issue of appropriate recognition of teaching responsibilities in review and tenure decisions. The commitment of new faculty to teaching, as demonstrated by the amount of time they spend preparing their courses and meeting with students, belies the notion that many pretenure faulty sacrifice their teaching to gain time for research. Pretenure faculty would like their departments and the University to give teaching more weight in review and tenure decisions, and to seek more ways to recognize effective teaching.

Recommendation 13: All chairs and/or personnel committees should provide constructive feedback on research and teaching to new faculty. Early formal evaluations are a contributor to new faculty stress. New faculty worried about colleagues' evaluation of their research productivity and criticisms of their teaching by students. They recommended more supportive reviews of the first year, oriented to development rather than to evaluation.

BALANCING WORK AND FAMILY LIFE

Recommendation 14: Review personnel policies to assess their effects on the ability to balance work and family life. Addressing the changing needs of individuals and their families could yield advantages in recruitment, retention, productivity and morale. Respondents requested more information and job opportunities for dual career couples, and flexible employee benefits such as parental leaves, flexible time limit for tenure, part-time status for childrearing, and more and better childcare options.

WORKS CITED

Boice, R. (1991). New faculty. **Journal of Higher Education**, 62 (2), 150-173.

Baldwin, R., & Blackburn, R. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. **Journal of Higher Education**, 52 (6), 598-614.

Blackburn, R. & Havinghurst, R. (1979). Career patterns of U.S. male academic social scientists. **Higher Education**, 8, 553-572.

Fink, D.L. (1984). **The first year of college teaching**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Johnsrud, L.K., & Atwater, C.D. (1991). **Barriers to retention and tenure at the University of Hawaii-Manoa**. University of Hawaii: Office of Academic Affairs.

Olsen, D. & Sorcinelli, M.D. (1992). The pretenure years: A longitudinal perspective. In M.D. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), **Developing new and junior faculty**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Near, J.P., Smith, C.A., Rice, R.W., and Hunt, R.G. (1983). Job satisfaction and nonwork satisfaction as components of life satisfaction. **Journal of Applied Social Psychology**, 13 (2), 126-144.

Sorcinelli, M.D., & Austin, A. (Eds.). (1992). **Developing new and junior faculty**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sorcinelli, M.D. (1985, April). **Faculty careers: Personal, institutional, and social dimensions**. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Il.

Whitt, E.J. (1991). Hit the ground running: Experiences of new faculty in a school of education at a research university. **Review of Higher Education**, 14 (2), 177-197.

TABLE ONE:

NEW AND UNTENURED FACULTY CAREER STUDY 1991

Sample

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
Total	23	185
Interviewed	20 (87%)	0
Questionnaires Returned	19 (82.6%)	100 (54.1%)

> The year one sample consisted of all faculty hired at the assistant or associate professor level for the 1990-91 academic year. New faculty who were hired but not yet present on campus (N=2) were removed. One faculty member resigned prior to the start of the study.

> The two-to-tenure sample consisted of all untenured tenure-track faculty and those faculty who received tenure during the 1990-91 academic year. Pretenure faculty who were on unpaid leave from campus (N=9) were removed.

TABLE TWO:

RANKED RATINGS OF WORK SATISFACTION WITH SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF A FACULTY CAREER

Sense of autonomy, the opportunity to use skills and abilities and impact on others were consistently among the most satisfying aspects of faculty's professional life. Perhaps not surprisingly, salary, fringe benefits, and job security were among the least satisfying. Below are ratings for each of the two cohorts ranked from highest to lowest.

Year One	Mean Ratings*	Years Two -> Tenure	Mean Ratings*
autonomy	4.44	autonomy	4.10
opportunity to use skills	4.11	opportunity to use skills	3.55
impact on others	3.79	impact on others	3.55
continued learning	3.74	recognition in discipline	3.52
sense of accomplishment	3.68	sense of accomplishment	3.37
support of colleagues	3.37	continued learning	3.27
particip in decision-making	3.32	particip in decision-making	3.04
feedback	3.26	support of colleagues	3.03
recognition of discipline	3.21	feedback	2.78
support of teaching	3.17	support of teaching	2.72
balance among research, teaching & service	3.00	recognition by university	2.59
support of administration	2.89	balance among research, teaching & service	2.56
recognition by university	2.88	support of scholarship	2.55
support of scholarship	2.72	support of administration	2.41
enough time to do work	2.50	enough time to do work	2.17
job security	2.39	job security	1.83
fringe benefits	2.32	fringe benefits	1.56
salary	2.05	salary	1.35

*** 1 = not satisfied**
5 = very satisfied

TABLE THREE:

WORK SATISFACTION

	Ratings of Satisfaction	
	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
very satisfied	37%	13%
somewhat satisfied	47%	48%
not too satisfied	16%	30%
not at all satisfied	0%	9%

> A test of mean ratings of work satisfaction indicated a statistically significant difference in mean ratings of job satisfaction--1.79 for the Year One group (1 = very satisfied) and 2.35 for Years Two through Tenure ($p < .006$).

TABLE FOUR:

WORK STRESS

The proportion of two-to-tenure faculty rating their worklife as very stressful was dramatically greater than among faculty in year one.

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
very stressful	29%	72%
fairly stressful	65%	27%
not very stressful	6%	1%
not at all stressful	0%	0%

TABLE FIVE:

FACETS OF AN ACADEMIC CAREER THAT DECLINE IN SATISFACTION FROM THE YEAR ONE TO THE TWO-TO-TENURE COHORT

	Change in Mean Ratings*		
	Year One	**Years Two -> Tenure**	
salary	2.05	1.35	(p=.000)**
fringe benefits	2.32	1.56	(p=.001)
opportunity to use skills	4.11	3.55	(p=.029)
opportunity for learning	3.74	3.27	(p=.043)
job security	2.39	1.83	(p=.045)
support for teaching	3.17	2.72	(p=.084)
balance between teaching, scholarship & service	3.00	2.56	(p=.099)

*** 1 = not satisfied**
5 = very satisfied

**** significant difference at given p value**

> Overall, findings show the highest ratings relate to the autonomous, intellectually challenging nature of the academic enterprise and a lower level of satisfaction with compensation. While the pattern of greater dissatisfaction with salary, fringe benefits and job security undoubtedly reflects the greater immediacy of tenure, lower satisfaction with some of the more intrinsic values of the career are less easily explained.

TABLE SIX:

FACULTY VIEWS OF THEIR CHOICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to choose the position you now have, what would you decide?

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
I would choose the same position	53%	36%
I would have second thoughts	47%	47%
I would not choose the same position	0%	17%

If a student or colleague told you that he or she was interested in seeking a position like yours at this university, what would you say?

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
I would recommend this position	28%	12%
I would have some doubts	72%	43%
I would advise against this position	0%	44%

In general, how well would you say that your position measures up to the sort of position you wanted when you started it?

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
It is very much what I wanted	53%	22%
It is something like I wanted, but not completely	47%	66%
It is not at all what I wanted	0%	12%

How likely is it that you would try hard to find a position with another university within the next year?

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
very likely	0%	53%
somewhat likely	58%	29%
not at all likely	42%	18%

TABLE SEVEN:

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT WHICH WOULD CONTRIBUTE MOST TO FACULTY'S PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	Mean Ratings of Importance*	
	Year One	**Years Two -> Tenure**
grants for research	4.72	4.47
released time/funding for teaching (e.g. Lilly, Faculty grants)	4.37	3.83
resources (e.g. library, lab, etc.)	4.21	4.11
funds for professional meetings	3.95	4.05
staff support	3.94	4.07
mentoring programs	3.53	3.03
facilities - office	3.37	3.35
orientation programs for new faculty	3.32	2.88
facilities - classroom	3.31	3.85
facilties - labs	3.23	3.71
teaching workshops	3.22	2.84
grant writing seminars	3.22	2.79
flexible leaves	3.20	3.13
tenure preparation seminars	3.11	2.54
classroom visits from colleagues	3.00	2.54
administrative opportunities	2.40	2.11

*** 5 = contribute a great deal**
1 = contribute very little

> Released time and increased funding for both teaching and research were consistent themes in faculty requests for institutional support.

TABLE EIGHT:

PERSONAL LIFE

Faculty indicated being **highly satisfied** with several aspects of their personal life:

	Mean Ratings of Satisfaction*	
	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
children	4.75	4.52
health	4.00	3.91
family life	3.46	3.95
marriage	3.39	4.12

> While measures of work satisfaction declined, measures of satisfaction with personal life increased from the year one to the two-to-tenure cohort.

Faculty indicated being **less than satisfied** with other aspects of their nonwork life:

	Mean Ratings of Satisfaction*	
	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
leisure	2.31	2.02
career opportunities for spouse	2.36	2.55
opportunity for social interaction	2.56	2.50
balance between work & personal life	2.57	2.31
standard of living	2.63	2.62
organizations outside of work	2.67	2.70
childcare options	2.67	2.56

*** 5 = very satisfied**
1 = not satisfied

TABLE NINE:

BALANCING WORK AND PERSONAL LIFE

Faculty were far more likely to feel adverse effects of work on personal life than vice versa.

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
negative effect of worklife on life outside of work	72%*	86%
negative effect of life outside of work on worklife	22%	40%

*** Percentage includes those who rated adverse effects of a great deal or somewhat (1 + 2 on a 4-point scale).**

> 22% of the first year faculty and 41% of the two-to-tenure cohort felt their worklife exercised "a great deal" of negative impact on their personal life.

TABLE TEN:

PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS EXPRESSING INTEREST IN PROGRAMS TO HELP FACILITATE PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL LIFE BALANCE

	Year One	Years Two -> Tenure
spouse job placement	77%	60%
parental leaves	64%	59%
flexible time limits for tenure	63%	57%
dual career info	58%	45%
part-time status for childrearing	55%	48%
flexible benefits	53%	69%
social opportunities	50%	32%
joint appointment	42%	25%
relaxing nepotism rules	25%	24%
childcare referral	22%	58%
counseling services	6%	26%
family/work seminars	6%	14%

> A high percentage of faculty respondents indicated institutional support for dual career couples would be helpful to them.

> Pretenure faculty highly endorsed flexible time limits for tenure and flexible benefits.

> A majority of faculty with children identifed difficulties with balancing parenting roles with work life. They advocated institutional flexibility in this sphere.